

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the office action mailed March 9, 2006. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 1-3 and 6-13.

### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2, 4 and 5 were rejected as providing insufficient antecedent basis for various terms used in these claims. The undersigned has reviewed all of the above-mentioned claims and has made minor amendments to claims 2 and 5, to eliminate any possibility of a lack of antecedent basis for the limitations used therein. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Minor amendments have been made to claim 1 to recite a "base station component". This eliminates any possible ambiguity as to this limitation. The undersigned has reviewed all of the remaining claims, in addition to the specification of the application, and believes that the claims are all now in form for allowance.

### **DRAWINGS**

Submitted herewith are formal drawings for the present application.

### **ABSTRACT**

A minor grammatical change has been made to the Abstract, on the last line thereof, to change "it" to its.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 9, 2006

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
MDE/jo